DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 505 SP 031 861

AUTHOR Johnson, Daniel P.
TITLE Education Reform through Shared Leadership: Define, Design, and Develop Rather than Decree.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (14th, San Antonio, TX, November 17-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Course Content; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Instructional Leadership; Lesson Plans; *Participative Decision Making; Secondary Education; *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

Increasingly, teachers are complaining that they have been left out of the decision-making process in terms of curriculum development. There has been a growing impetus for shared decision making and shared leadership. A curriculum mapping process is described which was successfully implemented in a large middle school. Through this mapping process, teachers listed the learning outcomes which existed in their taught curriculum. After developing educational goals and conducting education needs assessments, this curriculum mapping process was used to develop a Curriculum Monitoring Process. This consisted of three phases: (1) developing a written curriculum keyed to teachers' daily implementation through a learning outcome checklist; (2) monitoring curriculum implementation through a learning outcomes checklist; and (3) analyzing the congruence among the written, taught, tested, and learned curricula. The curriculum guide used to develop the written curriculum lists the department, strand, and grade level, the general concepts, time allotted to teach each concept, the learning outcomes indicating concept mastery, available resources, and method of evaluation. How this Curriculum Monitoring System was developed and implemented is described and briefly evaluated. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316505

Education Reform Through Shared Leadership:

Define, Design, and Develop

Rather Than Decree

By

Daniel P. Johnson, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Clear Creek School District
Idaho Springs, Colorado

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. P Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented to the
National Council of States on Inservice Education
Fourteenth Annual National Conference
San Antonio, Texas
November 17-21, 1989

SP 031 861

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Education Reform Through Shared Leadership:
Define, Design, and Develop
Rather Than Decree

I. Defining Shared Leadership: A Rationale

Today's education reform movement has been shaped by various factors, not the least of which has been the widespread perception that America is losing its competitive edge in science and technology to Japan and other foreign countries. As Cetron, Rocha, and Lucken point out, despite the fact that the median income in this country rose 4.5% from 1985 to 1986, despite the fact that the number of families earning $50,000 or more rose from 13% in 1970 to 18.3% in 1985, and despite the fact that the poor in this country number one in seven today as compared to one in five in 1960, the American people generally perceive themselves and this nation to be declining economically. They place much of the blame for this demise on the public schools, which they perceive to be failing in their responsibility for preparing young people to assume their roles in an increasingly technological workplace (1988).

Business leaders have also chided the public schools, because they (business) must do what they see the schools as having failed to do, i.e., teach people to read. Over 75% of this country's major corporations now offer literary enhancement programs to their employees. It is estimated that over 45 million job holding Americans are either functional illiterates or marginally functional illiterates, and it is further estimated that illiteracy costs this nation $225 billion annually in lost industrial production, prisons, crime, and related

social problems (The Futurist, 1988).

According to Cetron (1988) the world will continue to place ever increasing demands on those persons entering the workplace over the next decade. Fewer jobs will be assembly line in nature, and virtually all jobs will require workers to perform some sort of information generation and processing activities. Moreover, by Cetron's estimates knowledge will double four times during that same ten year period.

At the same time the American people will experience a significant evolution in basic cultural values. Plummer (1989) has identified this change in many areas such as the shift from a "live to work" ethic to a "work to live" ethic. People are beginning to view their jobs not as an end in themselves but as a means to an end - a better quality of life. He further suggests that while in the past success has generally been gauged according to position and wealth, today success is defined in much more personal terms. The once popular concept of self-denial is being replaced by the concept of self-fulfillment. Hero worship and faith in institutions is giving way to a love of ideas and a sense of self-reliance. People are exchanging a sense of unparalleled growth for a sense of limits.

Thus, whether the American people like it or not, their world is changing, and many people believe that the public schools have failed to keep pace with these changes. In fact, the very nature of the changes themselves makes it increasingly difficult for public school personnel to determine exactly what their response to the changes should be. One might ask, for example, how much the shift in values from self-denial to self-fulfillment has led young people to take less interest in the rigors of school. Likewise, with the replacement

of the traditional "school marm" with "real people" in the teaching ranks, one might speculate about the extent to which teachers now see their jobs as a life calling rather than as merely a means to meet their own needs and goals. How much has the shift from hero worship and faith in institutions to love of ideas and self-reliance encouraged teachers to question the authority of administrators and boards of education? Finally, as the median age continues to rise and the school age population continues to decline (Cetron, 1985), how much will support for the public schools continue to wane?

As society evolves in terms of both technology and values, the pressure on schools to broaden their decision making base will accelerate. Teachers will not follow their leaders blindly (hero worship and faith in institutions). Parents will no longer simply trust the schools to make the right decisions regarding their children's education (faith in institutions). The non-parent public, furthermore, will become less likely to support public schools in which they have no direct voice in the decision making process. Because of an overwhelming sense of limits, people will expect the schools to operate more efficiently. It appears likely, therefore, that the only way to broaden support for the public schools is to involve more people in the schools' decision making process. As Saphier and King (1985) point out, when decisions are viewed as legitimate, people feel appropriately involved. Those who feel included in the school's decision making process generally tend to support a final decision even when it runs counter to their personal views.

Compounding the issue of involvement in these decision making processes, however, is the general level of concern which many people experience when they confront change.

This is particularly true when the need for change is identified by someone other than the person responsible for making the change, and it this change phenomenon which is considered in the following section of this paper.

II. Designing Shared Leadership: Leading a Change Process

As noted above, much of the impetus for changing the public schools has not come from classroom teachers, those persons responsible for implementing any changes. One scathing indictment of the public schools, however, has come from a school superintendent who suggests that "...the existing school structure [is] harmful to many, ineffective for others, and only meaningful to those who would have learned anyway," (Champlin, 1987).

This school leader and many like him are suggesting that public schools in this country must undertake some fundamental changes if we are to be responsive to the needs of our students and the demands of our technologically complex world. If such changes are to be successful, especially since they are being driven from outside the classroom, all those involved in the change process must recognize certain aspects of that process. Fullan (1982) suggests ten assumptions which should be considered in such change processes. These are as follows:

1. Do not assume that your version of what the change should be is the one that should or could be implemented.
2. Assume that any significant innovation requires individual implementors to work out their own meaning.
3. Assume that conflict and disagreement are not only inevitable but fundamental

to successful change.

4. Assume that people need pressure to change.

5. Assume that effective change takes time.

6. Do not assume that the reason for lack of implementation is outright rejection of the values embodied in the change or hard-core resistance to all change.

7. Do not expect all or even most people to change.

8. Assume that you will need a plan which is based on the above assumptions and which addresses the factors known to affect implementation.

9. Assume that no amount of knowledge will ever make it totally clear what action should be taken.

10. Assume that change is a frustrating, discouraging business.

Because change is a frustrating process both for an administrator trying to lead the change process and for a teacher trying to implement the actual change, both administrators and teachers should be aware of stages common to most change processes. Such stages have been identified by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1972) in their research at the University of Texas. Although some individuals or groups may proceed through these stages more rapidly than others, these researchers believe that most change processes move through more or less the same stages as follows:

Stage 0 Awareness Little concern or involvement with the innovation

Stage 1 Information General awareness and interest in learning more

Stage 2 Personal Uncertainty about the demands of the innovation, their adequacy to meet those demands, and their roles

Stage 3 Management Focus on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources

Stage 4 Consequences Focus on the impact of the innovation on students

Stage 5 Collaboration Coordination and cooperation with others

Stage 6 Refocusing Exploration of more universal benefits

By considering these assumptions about change and the stages which most change processes generally follow, school administrators and teachers should be better prepared to undertake a change process in their schools. It seems clear, however, that researchers are finding change to be an extremely difficult process to lead or to follow. Conflict over the direction that the change process should follow is not only inevitable but desirable. Change takes time and patience, and not everyone will recognize the need for change at the same time; nor, in fact, will everyone recognize the need for the same change. What the research of both this and the previous sections seems to indicate, however, is that when people are involved in the decision making process regarding the change and are encouraged to proceed from one stage of the change process to the next with or without pressure, the change being sought has a much better chance of being implemented successfully. It was based on such assumptions that much of the curriculum development process described in the next section was conducted.

III. Developing Shared Leadership: Structures for Change

Today a school's curriculum is as likely to be a part of a lay citizens discussion as it is to be a topic of a school inservice. With more people questioning the ability of the

public schools to respond to the needs of students and to the needs of an increasingly technological workplace, most citizens have at least a fundamental understanding that the curriculum defines a school's attempt to structure the teaching/learning process. Moreover, increasing numbers of lay citizens, whether parents, business leaders, or legislators, are demanding a voice in shaping that curriculum. At the same time, teachers are complaining that they too have been left out of the decision making process in terms of the curriculum. Thus, we see a growing impetus for shared decision making/ shared leadership.

As Saphier, Bigda-Peyton, and Pierson (1989) point out, however, the move toward shared leadership in the public schools will not in itself solve the problems facing education today either in terms of meeting the demands of a rapidly changing society or even in coping with the complexities of change within the schools themselves. Meaningful and long lasting change, they suggest, depends on the structures employed as a part of the change process.

It is such structures upon which the process for school improvement/curriculum development described here is based. In several school districts over the past twelve years I have attempted to lead a change process through curriculum development. Through various stages that process has evolved into a set of structures which involve four questions: 1) Why do we exist - our mission, philosophy, and goals? 2) What do we do to accomplish our mission - our curriculum? 3) How do we deliver the curriculum - instructional improvement? and 4) To what extent are we accomplishing our mission - evaluation? Since the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the importance of structures in

facilitating meaningful school reform through shared leadership, however, it is not nesessary to describe our school district's procedures in terms of all four of these questions. Instead, the description can be limited to the why and how questions.

Regarding why we exist - mission, philosophy, and goals of a school system - our district has discovered the importance of broad based participation of the various elements of the school community in the decision making process. In Clear Creek County we utilize our District Accountability Advisory Committee (DAAC) as the structure for assuring this shared leadership. The DAAC, appointed by the Board of Education, is comprised of students, parents, non-parent citizens (business people as well as senior citizens), and educators. They have developed a planning process, adopted by the Board as district policy, and through that process they have developed the district's mission, philosophy, and goals with input from their various constituencies. These documents appear as Appendices A and B of this paper, and all have become a part of Board policy.

The what question - the curriculum - and the main focus of this section, involves a much more detailed structure. Glatthorn (1987) who defines curriculum as "the plans made for guiding learning in schools...," refers to a written curriculum - that embodied in documents, a taught curriculum - what teachers actually teach in the classroom, a supported curriculum - that which is evidenced by resource support, a tested curriculum - the curriculum which appears in unit tests and final examinations, and a learned curriculum - knowledges, skills, and concepts which students actually master. He further suggests that in most schools goals and objectives demonstrated by the taught, supported,

tested, and learned curricula are not always congruent with the goals and objectives prescribed by the written curriculum. Such discrepancies cause consternation for curriculum administrators and often frustrate teachers who view curriculum development as a meaningless effort in paperwork. Teachers wish to be involved in decisions about the curriculum, but they want that involvement to be meaningful and significant. Many teachers perceive few concrete results from curriculum development activities. They too recognize that what is written is not always congruent with what is taught, supported, tested, and learned.

To eliminate some of these gaps between the various curriculum levels - at least between the written and taught curricula - Fenwick English developed a process for curriculum mapping (1978; 1983). Through this mapping process teachers listed the learning outcomes which existed in their taught curriculum, i.e., what they expected students to learn. In some cases that list provided a comparison to a written curriculum, or in cases where no written curriculum existed, it became the basis for such a document.

In 1982, after developing educational goals and conducting education needs assessments, I used this curriculum mapping process to develop a middle school curriculum for a school of 700 students (Johnson, 1982). Since that time I have initiated this process in three other school districts on a K-12 basis and have expanded it into a Curriculum Monitoring Process. This Curriculum Monitoring Process consists of three phases: 1) developing a written curriculum which can be keyed to teachers' daily lesson plans if so desired, 2) monitoring curriculum implementation through a learning outcomes checklist,

and 3) analyzing the congruence among the written, taught, tested, and learned curricula. The curriculum guide format used to develop the written curriculum appears as follows:

Department English Strand Literature Grade 7

Concept		Time	Learning Outcome	Resources	Evaluation
A.	Short Story	10 Days	Students should be able to: A. List... B. Recall... C. Describe	Stories to Remember	Composition Teacher made tests

The curriculum guide lists the department, strand, and grade level, the general concepts, the time allotted to teach each concept, the learning outcomes which indicate concept mastery, the available resources, and the methods of evaluation. Labelling each concept (A, B, C) and numbering each learning outcome (A1, A2, A3) facilitates their location for possible use in writing lesson plans and in reviewing the written curriculum. It also eliminates the necessity of re-writing learning outcomes for daily lesson plans. In some school districts this lesson plan format has been considered a tremendous time-saver, although Clear Creek teachers have chosen not to pursue this option. When it is utilized, however, the lesson plan format, which appears below, then ties the written curriculum to the taught curriculum.

LESSON PLAN FOR THE WEEK OF:_____ GROUP_____
_____Beginning/ _____Middle/ _____End of Unit Strand_____

LEARNING OUTCOMES:
See Curriculum Guide

RESOURCES

1. Filmstrip/slide projector
2. 16mm
3. VCR
4. Tape Recorder/player
5. Record player
6. Overhead/opaque
7. Television
8. Handout
9. Quiz/test
10. Language Skills
11. Guide to English
12. Methods of Research
13. Timeless Voyages
14. Purpose
15. Other_____

STRATEGIES:
1. Individual Instruction
2. Small group
3. Lab
4. Question-answer
5. Lecture
6. Boardwork
7. Learning centers
8. Discussion

EVALUATION:
1. Excellent
2. Advanced only
3. Remedial only
4. Need articulation
5. Other_____

COMMENTS:

Monday

LEARNING OUTCOME(S):
STRATEGIES:
OUTLINE OR QUESTIONS:

EVALUATION:

9. Student presentation
10. Testing
11. Other_____

The information at the top of the form identifies the period covered by the plan, the group for which the plan is designed, the position of the plan within the unit, and the

strand. Available resources are numbered on the left side of the form, as are strategies. A different form may be developed for art, music, industrial arts, etc., but for all subjects an additional space (Other) should be provided for teachers to add their own resources. Next, several evaluations are listed, again including a space for "other." This block is followed by a space for general comments (location of materials, dates for assemblies, etc.). Then follow blocks for daily plans (Tuesday through Friday blocks appear on an adjoining page).

Since the learning outcome is keyed to the curriculum guide, the teacher simply writes beside the words "learning outcome" a letter/number corresponding to a learning outcome from the curriculum guide, e.g., A1. Because several strategies are listed on the form, a number suffices here also. Likewise, a number is used for resources and for evaluation. The only writing required of the teacher is an outline of procedures or a list of questions. At the end of each week the building principal collects the lesson plans and records on a learning outcomes checklist the date(s) when each learning outcome was presented. The checklist used for this purpose appears below.

Teacher Smith Department English Grade 7 Strand Short Story

A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	C1	C2	C3
1-6 2-9 3-7	2-9	2-11	3-6	2-9	1-11	1-19	2-11	1-9	2-19	1-6

The teacher's name, the department, the grade, and the strand appear at the top of the checklist. The letter/number combinations across the page refer to learning outcomes from the curriculum guide. Some departments may have three pages or more per checklist depending upon the number of concepts and learning outcomes listed under each strand in their curriculum guide. The principal records the date under each learning outcome covered by the teacher on a given day whether that outcome has been covered in ten minutes or in forty minutes. Absolute accuracy in minutes is not important since these checklists are designed only for use in general comparisons and analyses.

In Clear Creek School District, a small district where teachers may be responsible for several preparations, the lesson plan and checklist phases of this process have been combined into one phase. Here teachers have continued to use their own lesson plan forms, and they have revised their monitoring forms to consist of a list of learning outcomes for each course that they teach. Thus, they complete their own monitoring forms by marking a date beside the learning outcome each time that learning outcome is covered in class. Then they submit this monitoring form for the principal's review on a periodic basis.

For elementary teachers and high school teachers who have several preparations each day, this procedure limits the necessity of leafing through the pages of several curriculum guides to locate learning outcomes for various lesson plans. Moreover, teachers recommended that they monitor not more than two subject areas per year regardless of the number of subjects they might teach. At the beginning of the year the principals assign

teachers the subjects they are to monitor to assure that all subject areas are monitored at each grade level every year. Then from year to year teachers will monitor different subjects so that they develop a better understanding of the extent to which their taught curricula mirror the written curricula.

IV Results, Implications, and Conclusions

As I have implemented various phases of the Curriculum Monitoring Process in four school districts, teachers and administrators have raised questions regarding each phase. These questions include: Phase 1) developing a written curriculum - Is a written curriculum really necessary? Phase 2) monitoring curriculum implementation - Is the process cumbersome, and will it stifle teachers' creativity? Phase 3) analyzing curriculum congruence - Will the process result in any real improvements in instruction or student achievement?

The necessity of a written curriculum - the first phase of the Curriculum Monitoring Process - has been poignantly illustrated in two different school districts. In both districts math teachers contended that individuals within their departments had already agreed on expected learning outcomes, even though these outcomes did not appear in any written documents. However, as teachers argued against writing their curriculum, I began to hear such comments as, "Well, that's not exactly what I mean when I say students should... Do you expect students to...?"

"Of course; don't you?"

These comments were followed by a brief silence, somewhat embarrassed laughter, and, "Well, perhaps we should discuss our expected learning outcomes."

In Clear Creek County, where we have completed the first phase of the Curriculum Monitoring Process by designing strands, concepts, and learning outcomes and where we have also begun the second phase of monitoring curriculum implementation, both teachers and administrators initially expressed concern that developing a written curriculum might be a cumbersome process. Many people were skeptical about implementing the process in all subjects at the same time. However, results of a survey following our first work session indicated almost unanimous agreement among the staff that our existing curricula lacked both horizontal and vertical articulation. In that same survey teachers indicated by a 3:1 margin that they perceived this first phase of the Curriculum Monitoring Process to be an effective method for obtaining such articulation.

As a principal in the first district where I implemented the Curriculum Monitoring Process, I initially held a similar concern about the time required to maintain the learning outcomes checklist - the second phase of the process. However, I soon discovered that I could monitor thirty-four teachers' lesson plans in approximately one and one-half hours per week.

Nevertheless, beyond these concerns about efficiency teachers in all four districts have also expressed concern that the process might stifle their creativity. The most telling response to this concern came from a middle school teacher following the first year of monitoring curriculum implementation in her district. She said, "I have had plenty of room

for creativity in my teaching, but this process does make us accountable." Then she added, "For the first time in years I feel like a professional, or as you say, like a curriculum decision maker."

Encouraging teachers to become curriculum decision makers marked an important step toward improving the teaching/learning process. The next step then consisted of encouraging teachers to become analytical professionals, i.e., to analyze the congruence among the written, taught, tested, and learned curricula. In 1982, as we began to analyze our standardized test results in English and mathematics, my middle school staff and I discovered that the Curriculum Monitoring Process could facilitate improvements in instruction and student achievement. In the first step of our analysis we identified, from standardized tests which matched our written curriculum, skills that our students were not mastering. Although I believed these poor test results to be related to instructional strategies, the staff perceived the problem to be related to time-on-task. Therefore, during the following year we used our learning outcomes checklist to monitor instructional time devoted to various learning outcomes. When 1983 test results indicated no significant difference in student achievement from the previous year, the teachers suggested that our problem might be related more to instructional strategies than to time-on-task. Consequently, we revised instructional strategies in mathematics and English based on teachers' analyses of need. Teachers requested inservice training and new materials, and 1984 test results indicated significant improvement in student achievement. Scores in English and mathematics at all three grade levels improved to varying degrees from the

low to mid-fifty percentile range to the upper fifty to mid-sixty percentile range.

My experience in four school districts has indicated that the Curriculum Monitoring Process enhances the role of educators as curriculum decision makers. The simplicity of the curriculum guide format, the lesson plan format, and the learning outcomes checklist makes the process relatively easy to create and manage. The process rejects the concept of a packaged curriculum imposed upon teachers in favor of a curriculum designed, implemented, and evaluated by teachers. It provides a tool for curriculum analysis and revision, and it becomes a catalyst for staff development based on needs identified by teachers. By sharing the learning outcomes checklist with teachers, a principal can initiate a dialogue regarding instruction and can encourage teachers to share their checklists at department meetings as an analysis of time allocations and instructional strategies. Moreover, by comparing the checklists with teacher made and standardized test results, educators can begin to analyze the congruence among the written, taught, tested, and learned curricula of their school.

It seems evident, therefore, that shared leadership is a viable tool for promoting meaningful school reform when it is implemented through some type of systematic administrative structure. Furthermore, Curriculum Monitoring as it is described here can provide that structure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Business Fights Illiteracy," The futurist. January-February, 1988.

Cetron, M. "Class of 2000," The futurist. November-December, 1988.

Cetron, M. Schools of the future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1985.

Cetron, M., Rocha, W., and Lucken, R. "Think Big or ThinK Small," The futurist. September-October, 1988.

English, F.W. Practice in mapping a hypothetical social studies curriculum as a technique/application of exercising quality control in curriculum development. Arlington, Va: National Center for the Improvement of Learning, 1978.

English, F.W. Fundamental curriculum decisions. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1983 Yearbook Committee, 1983.

Glatthorn, A.A. Curriculum renewal. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1987.

Johnson, D.P. Educational needs assessment: A practical guide for the overworked middle school principal. Seattle: Educational Resources Information Center, 1982.

Plummer, J. "Changing Values," The futurist. January-February, 1989.

Saphier, J., Bigda-Peyton, T., and Pierson, G. How to make decisions that stay made. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,1989.

Appendix A

CLEAR CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-1
Planning Process

Step 1:

During the period from January through May of each year the Superintendent will obtain input in the formation of district goals from the Accountability Committee, the Administrators, the Teachers (including the teacher Communication Committee) and the Support Staff (including the Support Staff Communication Committee). To gain community-wide input, the Accountability Committee shall complete a district-wide survey of the community at least every two years. The Superintendent will prepare explanatory data in support of the proposed goals including a forecast of necessary resources and information from accreditation audits. All information will be used to help the Superintendent and the School Board establish goals. After receiving input from these groups,the Superintendent will present the district goals to the School Board for their consideration.

The goals will be short term (to be accomplished in one or two years) and long term (to be accomplished in five years, being reviewed at least every two years). The School Board will set the long and short range goals for the School District. The Superintendent will then distribute these goals to the Accountability Committee, the Administrators, the Teachers, other School Staff, and Committees that have been formed within the school district and will designate those individuals or groups that will be responsible for achieving the goals. The designated individuals or groups will be responsible for developing building/department action plans to achieve the district goals. These Action Plans will include objectives, planned activities and processes for meeting those objectives, timelines, methods of evaluation, and persons responsible for carrying out the plan.

Step 2:

The Principal of each school or the Director of a School District Program will be responsible for establishing the short and long term objectives for the individual schools/departments. The Principal/Director, in formulating objectives, will obtain input from the community, the parents, the students attending the school, and the teachers teaching in the school and will include the input from these groups as a part of the objectives for the school.

The Superintendent shall bring to the first Accountability Committee meeting in June the Objectives portion of the Action Plans prioritized from each building/department for implementation for the following year.

It will be the responsibility of the Accountability Committee to assure that these objectives from the individual schools document students, parents, non-parent citizens and educators' involvement in the process of formulating those objectives.

Completed action plans from the identified groups are to be submitted to the Superintendent by October 1st of each year. Objectives must be prioritized by each principal/director and must include an estimated cost and identified resources. These objectives will be considered for implementation during the following school year.
The Accountability Committee will discuss the Objectives and Action Plans at their regularly scheduled meetings and solicit input from other elements of the school community as needed.

Step 3:

The Superintendent shall submit the prioritized Objectives and Action Plans to the School Board at the first Board meeting following October 1st. The Superintendent shall notify all Administrators of the Objectives and Action Plans that have been approved by October 15th.

Step 4:

The Superintendent shall meet with each Administrator by February 15th, to determine progress on Action Plans and to offer assistance where appropriate. By June 1st, the Administrators shall report in writing to the Superintendent the progress that has been made concerning their Objectives and will list possible causes of incompleted objectives along with proposed solutions. The Superintendent will then bring to the first Accountability Committee meeting in June, information concerning progress on Objectives for the present school year. The Accountability Committee will discuss this information and will provide input and assistance to the Superintendent regarding same. By August 1st the Superintendent will submit a written report advising the School Board on the progress that has been made on meeting objectives for that year as well as objectives that had completion dates set five years in advance.

Step 5:

The Superintendent shall at the first board meeting in November make any necessary recommendations for revisions of this planning process. Such recommendations will be based on information provided by the Accountability Committee and any other groups mentioned herein.

NOTE: If the Accountability Committee's opinion differs with the Superintendent regarding proposed Goals and/or Objectives or the manner in which those objectives have been prioritized and/or achieved, it will be the Committee's obligation to present those views to the School Board.

Appendix B

CLEAR CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-1
MISSION, PHILOSOPHY, GOALS

MISSION

The mission of the Clear Creek School District RE-1 shall be to provide opportunities for all individuals to develop the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to live happy, productive lives as citizens of the community, the state, the nation, and the world.

PHILOSOPHY

Clear Creek School District RE-1 exists to meet the educational needs of Clear Creek County youth.

Regarding students and learning, we believe...

.That every child is a unique and significant member of our society.

.That all children should acquire basic academic, critical thinking, decision making, and applied life skills to the best of their ability.

.That all children have a right to learn within a safe, positive and supportive school environment.

.That children learn most effectively when they have a positive image of themselves.

.That every human's natural inquisitiveness and desire to learn should be recognized.

.That children respond positively to high but realistic expectations for learning.

.That learning is a means for individuals to attain happiness and

a sense of personal fulfillment.

.That all learning should encourage self-discipline and responsibility.

Regarding teachers and teaching, we believe...

.That teaching is an honorable profession which requires talented individuals who are committed to ongoing professional growth.

.That teaching excellence should be recognized and rewarded.

.That teachers are curriculum decision-makers responsible for meeting students' needs within the context of the written curriculum.

.That students' needs are best met by educators who are empathetic, are good communicators, are skilled in their subject area(s) and in instructional strategies, understand child development, and have a good rapport with children.

.That as role models educators have unique opportunities to affect the lives of young people.

Regarding the school district and schooling, we believe...

.That district decisions should be guided by the school district's mission and this philosophy statement.

.That schools should help students become responsible lifelong learners.

.That the school district should be operated by a defined Planning Process and decision making structure that assures input from all elements of the total school community (students, parents, non-parent citizens and school employees).

.That positive, open communications among all elements of the total school community enhance cooperation and progress toward the

school's mission.

.That the school should be a dynamic organization capable of adapting to the needs of a changing society.

.That education is the joint responsibility of students, parents, non-parent citizens, and school employees.

.That the school district, as a public entity, is responsible to provide the highest quality education possible within the constraints of available resources.

GOALS FOR CLEAR CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-1

Clear Creek County School District RE-1 recognizes the dignity and human value of each student. It shall be the responsibility of the Clear Creek County School District and community to create learning environments for students to:

A. Gain an understanding of self and others by:

1. Developing skills and attitudes needed to clarify and modify personal values and goals.
2. Acquiring the attitude's, skills, and knowledges which are necessary to develop personal talents.
3. Developing the skills, attitudes, and values which are necessary for human interaction.
4. Developing the wisdom, attitudes, skills, and values necessary to exercise their political rights and responsibilities as well as to benefit from the privileges and freedoms guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution.
5. Developing an awareness of the contributions of human cultural heritage to the past, present, and future quality of life.

B. Master basic skills by:

1. Developing the capability and desire to use reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills as tools for lifelong learning.
2. Developing the necessary mathematical skills to function in their life roles.

3. Developing the capability to find information to aide in daily living, problem solving, and decision making.
4. Observing, analyzing, and drawing conclusions from situations that exist in the social and natural worlds.
5. Developing skills in and appreciation of the arts (art, music, and drama).

C. Assess change in terms of historical analysis and emerging trends and technologies by:

1. Developing an awareness of historical trends and movements which are shaping our nation, its policies, and its future.
2. Utilizing science and technology and exploring their effects on people's efforts to meet their physical needs.
3. Exploring the relationship between the natural environment and human activities.

D. Develop skills and attitudes needed to gain from and contribute to our society by:

1. Becoming knowledgeable and self-directed in establishing and pursuing their career development plans.
2. Developing the skills and acquiring the attitudes and values needed to manage their personal assets.
3. Developing an understanding of the role of production, distribution, and consumption in an economic community.

Appendix C

CLEAR CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-1
Curriculum Development

A premise often overlooked or at least unstated at the outset of a curriculum development process is that teachers are for the most part conscientious, dedicated professionals who work diligently at their teaching responsibilities. Nevertheless, these individuals frequently resist curriculum development efforts because they are not given adequate time to perform planning tasks, they see a written curriculum as dictatorial rather than facilitative, and/or they perceive little use for a written curriculum beyond collecting dust between accreditation evaluations.

Curriculum development in the Clear Creek School District will be based on the premise that teachers are (or at least can be) curriculum decision makers who first develop an articulated curriculum and then base their instructional strategies on an analysis of expected learning outcomes relative to the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of their students.

Two questions which will guide our curriculum development process are: 1) Why are we here - mission, philosophy, and goals? 2) What do we do to accomplish our mission - curriculum?

Because mission and goals require the commitment of the total school community, we will ask the Accountability Committee to develop and implement a process to obtain input from students, parents, non-parent citizens, and educators relative to these area. Toward that end, the Accountability Committee is currently collecting mission statements from local school districts in an effort to develop a statement for Clear Creek. I am then asking the Committee to obtain input from all elements of the school community regarding our mission.

Once that mission has been defined, the Committee can take school district goals as developed in 1979 and determine the extent to which those goals continue to reflect the will of our community. Again they will obtain input from students, parents, non-parent citizens, and educators.

The "what" of our process - curriculum - then becomes a staff focus. Although we will open ourselves to public scrutiny regarding the extent to which our programs accomplish district goals - accountability - program design recommendations will be channeled to the Board via the district staff responsible for a particular area. The planning process relative to instruction for example will proceed according to a six year cycle as follows:

Year 1:
Needs Assessment -
Math

Year 2: Budget - Math
Needs Assessment -
Social Studies

Year 3: Budget-Social Studies
Needs Assessment
Language Arts

Year 4:
Budget - Language Arts
Needs Assessment -
Reading

Year 5: Budget-Reading
Needs Assessment -
Science

Year 6: Budget - Science
Needs Assessment -
Special Areas

In this example (subject order within the cycle has not been determined) year one is a year to assess needs in mathematics. To assess needs, the Accountability Committee will obtain data on Community perceptions of the extent to which we are accomplishing mathematics goals, and we will compare those perceived needs to standardized test data in order to update the mathematics curriculum.

During the second year of the cycle, the mathematics action plan as identified in year one will become the budget focus. At the same time a needs assessment of social studies will begin. In year three the social studies action plan will become the budget focus and language arts needs will be assessed. This process will continue through a six year cycle.

Since there are currently no written K-12 curriculum guides, it will also be necessary for us to implement an immediate curriculum development process in each subject area. These guides will then plug into the six year planning cycle at the appropriate time. Consequently, the social studies team will be working on curriculum guides simultaneously with their needs assessment; whereas, other teams will have one or more years to develop curriculum guides prior to their needs assessment/planning year.

Teachers will develop curriculum guides according to the following timetable:

1987-88	Strands and Learning Outcomes
1988-89	Activities & Resources and Cognitive Levels
1989-90	Critical Thinking and Evaluation

Toward this end, we have developed the following K-12 Curriculum Teams: Language Arts and Media, Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Practical ARts, Fine Arts, and Student Services. Secondary teachers will serve on committees according to their teaching

assignment. Elementary teachers have been grouped on teams to achieve a balance by grade and building with consideration being given to teacher interests where possible. (Any elementary teacher who is dissatisfied with his/her team assignment should contact the building principal-requests for a team change will be considered but cannot be guaranteed.) Each team will be led jointly by a secondary department chair and one or more elementary unit leaders. An administrator will also sit on each team.

The curriculum guide formate will appear as follows:

Subject:_____ Grade Level:_____

Strand	Learning Outcome	Time	Resources & Activities	Cognitive Level	Evaluation
A. Liter-ature	Students should be able to:		Stories to Remember	1	Composition Teacher Made Tests
	A. Short Story A1. List... A2. Recall...	10 days			

Our schedule for the 1987-88 school year will be:

August 26:	Process described; teams identified; sample guides distributed
October 12:	Come to meeting with strands by grade level; discuss overlapping areas, gaps, and appropriate placement of strands; what the "experts" say distributed to each team.
January 18:	Strands re-examined in terms of what the "experts say;" begin writing learning outcomes in groups: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12.
February 15:	K-12 meetings by teams to assure grade-to-grade articulation.
June 3:	Final reports; set 88-89 agenda

Program planning requires a significant amount of time and effort. Yet, it is the program which provides the structure for everything we do on a daily basis. If we don't have a

program to guide us toward our goals, we will have a group of conscientious individuals expending tremendous amounts of effort in 98 different directions. A curriculum guide should never be designed to be teacher-proof, i.e., as a structure so rigid that teachers cannot exercise their own judgment and rely on their own teaching styles and personal strengths. However, an effective guide should guarantee parents and the community that students in our schools will be instructed through a common core curriculum regardless of the teacher or the building they attend. Particular learning experiences may vary from one classroom to another based on student and teacher needs and interest, and levels of mastery may vary according to students' abilities, needs, and interests. Nevertheless, there will exist a common core for all students.

As a final word of caution, let us remember that programs are not ends in themselves. Rather, they are means toward an end. Our end, our total reason for being is people. We are people builders. Instead of considering ourselves as a factory turning out a finished product or a hospital curing sick people, let's consider ourselves to be an educational HMO (Health Maintenance Organization). For the most part God has provided us complex, unique, but healthy human beings. Our job is to maintain and develop that health - physical, intellectual, social/emotional, and spiritual.